

San Francisco, April 18, 1926.

TO THE EDITOR:

Just a line to say that I prefer sewing CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN MEDICINE instead of stapling as heretofore.

EWALD ANGERMANN, M. D.

University of California Medical School,
April 13, 1926.

TO THE EDITOR:

I wish to thank you again for the interest you have taken in the experiment in medical education carried on at the University of California Medical School and for the excellent presentation of it in the April number of CALIFORNIA AND WESTERN MEDICINE. The article has proved of interest to members of our own faculty, and I have been very much encouraged by the inquiries and comments it has aroused. We have ordered a thousand reprints of the symposium, and intend to distribute them to the students and faculty.

It may interest you to know we are continuing the instruction this year, and have six seniors taking their month in Medicine with outside physicians. I appreciate very much your endorsement of the plan and its presentation before the medical profession.

WILLIAM J. KERR.

Los Angeles, April 14, 1926.

TO THE EDITOR:

For many years manufacturing opticians have made a practice of returning to the referring oculist a considerable proportion of the amount charged the patient. The physician specializing in eye work has grown to expect this rebate, and even to demand it if his percentage is not forthcoming promptly. Naturally, not being a philanthropist, the optician adds to a fair price for lenses and frames the sum he is expected to pass back to the physician. It is assumed that no patient is ordered to wear spectacles in order to add to the doctor's income, and so this practice is ethical.

Representatives of two corset manufacturers of national repute have called upon me to advance their arguments as to why I should advise my expectant mothers to wear their belts and corsets, and in concluding, have stated that for every patient so referred, I will be given the customary sum of \$2. It is assumed that I am going to order corseting anyway, and so this practice is ethical.

Two clinical laboratories here in Los Angeles are frankly rebating a portion of the amounts collected. One makes a charge to the physician, but collects whatever sum the physician may elect to charge, and the difference arrives at the physician's office. The other charges the patient a fixed sum, and rebates 25 per cent dividends on the \$100 the physician has invested. This practice is in question, but so far, since the rebates are limited to actual stockholders, the practice is denied to be unethical.

A patient, needing an appendectomy or tonsillectomy, or the Lord knows what, is referred by a physician to a surgeon. The surgeon, just as the optical house, the corset manufacturer, and the laboratory, depends upon the referring physician for the bulk of his income. But he dares not show his appreciation in the same manner, for such would be fee-splitting and highly unethical. Wherein lies the difference?

I can see no essential difference between fee-splitting of operative charges and rebates from professional laboratories and business houses. I think the subject might call for profitable discussion.

I prefer not to have my name published.

_____, M. D.

We have endless statistics, these days, of defects and defectives. The layman is often confused and confounded by these exhibits, and even the physician may gasp a little at the amazing state of affairs which is sometimes supposed to be revealed. What is a defect? Does a wart deserve the distinction, and when? Is an inequality in length of feet a defect, and which foot is defective? George Washington had a deformity of the chest. Was the father of his country defective? If so, his children might well have such an inheritance.—Medical Journal and Record, March 17, 1926.

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

C. B. PINKHAM, M. D., *Secretary*

The San Bernardino Sun of January 21, 1926, relates the arrest of Frank Taylor charged with forging a prescription blank of Dr. J. W. Aldridge for 20 half-grains of narcotics. The Board of Medical Examiners frequently have similar forgeries brought to their attention, such forgeries being made easy because of the narcotic registration number which most physicians and surgeons have printed on their prescription blanks. If this number were not printed thereon, it would not be possible for any impostor to know and enter the registration number of a specific physician.

Robert Belmont, giving his occupation as a chiropodist, but who does not appear on a list of those licensed in California, was recently charged with grand larceny of an automobile belonging to Mrs. Bertha Richards, according to the San Diego Evening Tribune, March 10, 1926.

J. Lafayette Berry, whose license to practice medicine and surgery in the state of California was revoked October 21, 1919, was recently charged with practicing without a license, the complaining witness alleging that she gave \$200 to Dr. Berry for the removal of an alleged cancer on the face and that "the infection was burned with acid for almost eight hours while she suffered great pain, and asserted that the 'operation' was not successful."—Pasadena Star-News, March 4, 1926.

The certificate entitling Herbert E. Bogue to practice as a physician and surgeon in the state of California was revoked March 11, 1926, after a hearing based upon narcotic charges.

Sally Broy, alleged voodoo doctor of Oakland, was recently charged with practicing medicine without a license. "Her method of treatment . . . consisted of stripping a patient to the waist, gazing through the thorax by light of a red lantern, by way of diagnosis, and then muttering weird incantations. The 'treatment' was furthered through a mystical, all-powerful salve . . ."—Oakland Times, February 25, 1926.

The appeal of Bishop W. L. Cosper, self-styled bishop of the Christian Philosophical Institute, who some time since was sentenced to ninety days in jail and a fine of \$500 for violation of the Medical Practice Act, was denied by the Appellate Court February 25, 1926.—Sacramento Union, February 26, 1926.

Dr. J. G. Ham of Los Angeles, his office assistant, Herbert Del Valle, and three others are reported to have been charged by the district attorney of Los Angeles in connection with the death of Miss Bessie McCarroll as the result of an alleged illegal operation.—Los Angeles Herald, March 12, 1926.

Rebecca Lee Dorsey, M. D., of Los Angeles was placed on five years' probation, following a hearing by the Board of Medical Examiners held March 11, 1926, in connection with her "goat-gland" announcement.

Dr. Richard Eble . . . who has just received the marked honor of being admitted to a fellowship in the American College of Chiropractors, is believed to be the only chiropractor in this vicinity who has ever been distinguished by the right to attach the four letters F. A. C. C. after his name.—Glendale News, March 11, 1926.

R. Thompson Fowler, alleged tubercular specialist, who has on prior occasions been charged with violation of the Medical Practice Act, was recently again charged with violation of the Medical Practice Act in Oakland.—San Francisco Chronicle, February 15, 1926.

At a regular meeting of the Board of Medical Examiners held in Los Angeles March 9, 1926, Dr. William S. Fowler of Bakersfield was placed on probation for five years and denied permission to handle or prescribe narcotics during that period. Dr. Fowler was charged with having prescribed and sold narcotics to known addicts in excessive amounts.—Los Angeles Examiner, March 10, 1926.

At a regular meeting of the Board of Medical Examiners held in Los Angeles March 10, 1926, Wendell O. Gregg, M. D., "was found guilty of unprofessional conduct and given five years' probation. The board also